REMARKS

New claims 12 – 18 have been added. Therefore claims 1 – 18 remain pending in the present application. The rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

The Title

The Office Action requested a new title. A title was amended above to "Digital Camera with Image File Transmission."

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 – 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **Narayen et al.** (USP 6,035,323) in view of **Wakui et al.** (US Publication 2001/0012060) and **Takemoto** (USP 6,335,742). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **Narayen**, **Wakui**, **Takemoto** and further in view of **Tanaka** (JP 11-191870). Claims 9 – 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **Narayen** in view of **Nazari** (USP 6,335,742).

The Office Action alleged that **Narayen** disclosed a digital camera having a first transmitter, a first receiver, and a selector. The further reference to **Wakui** was made for the alleged disclosure of an eraser. The further reference to **Takemoto** was made for allegedly disclosing a second receiver.

However, the components of a first transmitter, a first receiver and a selector are all part of a computer system 501. The alleged disclosures in **Narayen** for the claimed first transmitter, first receiver, and selector do not exist in a digital camera.

The Office Action alleged that the computer system 501 can be considered to be a digital camera, referring to Figures 2 and 3, and column 5, line 56 – 60, and column 6, lines 33 – 40. However, these cited portions of **Narayen** do not support the assertions made in the Office Action.

In particular, column 5, lines 55 – 60 state "a digital image input device 521 may be a digital camera which is coupled to an I/O controller 517 in order to allow images from the digital camera to be input into the computer system 501." This statement clearly indicates that the digital image input device 521 is ***not*** the computer system 501. This statement clearly indicates that the digital image input device 521 must be "coupled to an I/O controller 517." While the I/O controller 517 may be part of the computer system 501, the digital image input device 521 is not part of the computer system 501. As stated in the quoted portion of **Narayen**, images from the digital camera are input into the computer system 501, through the I/O controller 517. The digital image input device 521 is a completely different device from the separate and distinct computer system 501.

Column 6, lines 33 – 40 states "the method of Figure 4 begins in step 201 in which a user inputs digital images from a digital acquisition device, such as a digital camera into a digital processing system." This sentence does not support the allegation in the Office Action that the digital camera is inside a digital processing system. On the contrary, the quoted sentence from column 6, lines 31 – 34 clearly indicates that the digital acquisition device is separate and distinct from a digital processing system since the images from the digital acquisition device must be inputted into the digital processing system.

Column 6, lines 34 - 40 merely clarify that the term "digital camera" is being used as a "short hand phrase to refer to the general group of digital acquisition devices, and that a digital camera is an example of a digital acquisition device." There is nothing in this disclosure which teaches or suggests that the digital camera or digital acquisition device is part of the digital processing system. On the contrary, the quoted passage indicates that the digital camera/digital acquisition device is separate and distinct from the digital processing system.

Based on the above discussion, the alleged corresponding components in **Narayen** for the present claimed first transmitter, first receiver and selector, is incorrect. None of the alleged corresponding disclosures in **Narayen** describe the claimed components within a digital camera.

This fundamental distinction affects the problem to be solved by the present invention. As described in the Background of the Invention section of the present application, storage capacity is an important issue within digital cameras. The present invention solves the storage capacity issues by transmitting recorded image files to an external storage device and then erases the image files after such transmission, but allowing the digital camera to receive size-reduced image signals from the external storage device, select desired size-reduced image signals, and receive the entire image file corresponding to the selected size-reduced image signal.

Narayen does not address such features regarding digital cameras since the computer system 501 does not have the same storage capacity problems that would exist in a digital camera. Indeed, **Narayen** indicates that image data must be transferred from a digital camera into the computer system 501. This teaches no more than the problems identified in the Background of the Invention section of the present application.

Nothing in the further references to **Wakui**, **Takemoto**, **Tanaka**, or **Nazari** remedies the deficiencies in the primary reference to **Narayen**.

For at least the reasons above, the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

New Claims 12-18

According to new independent claim 12, each of a main-image and a size-reduced image corresponds to a subject taken. An image file including the main-image and the size-reduced image is recorded to a recording medium. The image file recorded in the recording medium is transferred to an external storage device by a first transmitter. An eraser erases from the recording medium the image file transmitted by the first transmitter except for the size-reduced image.

When a display operation is carried out, the size-reduced image(s) remaining in the recording medium is displayed by a displayer. When a desired image is selected from among the size-reduced image(s) displayed by the displayer, a receiver receives the image file including the desired size-reduced image from the external storage device. The image file received by the receiver is recorded to the recording medium by a recorder.

The image file transmitted to the external storage device is erased from the recording medium by the eraser, and therefore, a vacant capacity is obtained in the recording medium. Consequently, an operator is able to carry out a shooting operation without needing to be concerned with the capacity of the recording medium.

Furthermore, a size-reduced image which is the same as the size-reduced image included in the image file which has been transferred to the external storage device remains in the recording medium. Accordingly, it is possible to rapidly confirm, by the display operation, what image is managed by the external storage device.

In addition, when a desired size-reduced image is selected, the image file including the selected size-reduced image is received from the external storage device so as to be recorded to the recording medium. Therefore, the recording medium can be easily restored to a state before the file transmission.

In contrast, **Narayen** disclose a method or an apparatus for publishing a collection of digital media on a network. However, since **Narayen** takes no notice of a memory capacity of a digital camera, **Narayen** fails to disclose or remotely suggest anything about erasing the image file as recited in new claim 12.

Wakui discloses a video camera which transmits image data to a remote controller when a CR mode is selected, receives the image data from the remote controller when an RC mode is selected, and erases the image data from a flash memory when an erasion mode is selected. However, **Wakui** fails to disclose or remotely suggest anything about erasing the image file except for the size-reduced image as recited in new claim 12.

Takemoto disclose in detail a constitution and an operation of an image processing apparatus which carries out communication with a digital camera. However, **Takemoto** does not disclose a constitution or an operation of a digital camera. **Takemoto** fails to disclose or remotely suggest anything about the erasing process as recited in new claim 12.

Even if any of **Narayen et al.**, **Wakui** and **Takemoto** were to be combined, for the sake or argument, such a hypothetical combination still would not disclose or remotely suggest anything about the erasing process as recited in new claim 12.

For at least these reasons, the present claimed invention of claim 12 and the dependent claims 13-18 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

John P. Kong
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,054

JPK:kal
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-1100
Q:\2000\001444\Filings\1.111 Amendment - June 2004.doc